DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 811 HE 006 884

AUTHOR Martin, Warren Bryan
TITLE Faculty Development and Evaluation or a Response to Student Interests and Needs.
PUB DATE 13 Jan 75
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges (Washington, D.C., January 1975); Not available in hard copy due to marginal reproducibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Instruction; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; *Faculty; Faculty Evaluation; *Higher Education; Individual Development; Instructional Improvement; Job Development; Organizational Development; *Professional Continuing Education; Program Development; Staff Improvement; Student Interests; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

Faculty development programs in colleges and universities must be faulted for not having adequate theory, employing comprehensive approaches, or showing a deep intention. An adequate theory of faculty development will involve a sophisticated understanding of the process of professionalization and an integrating theory of human development. Approaches, in terms of strategies and tactics, must respond to the interests and needs of students, faculty, and society. Deep qualitative objectives defy quantification but remain unquestionably important. The case for facutly development includes the faculty need to be prepared to work with new students in new places, to be made acquainted with alternative modes of teaching and learning, to be more sophisticated in their knowledge of the workings of the institution, and to become more conscious of the end of the learning experienc- for which teaching is a means. Behind the case for faculty development is the concern for institutional survival and for the needs of the larger society. Clearly we need more than the psychological-developmental approach, which deals mainly with the strengthening of the individual, even as we need more than the administrative-bureaucratic approach, which measures development by institutiona' criteria. (JT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche ard hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED112811

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRESENTATION

at

ANNUAL MEETING

of the

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

January 13, 1975

Washington Hilton Hotel

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OR A RESPONSE TO STUDENT INTERESTS AND NEEDS

by

Warren Bryan Martin

Vice President

The Danforth Foundation

St. Louis, Missouri

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AS HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Faculty development programs in colleges and universities must be faulted for three reasons: first, they do not have adequate theory; second, they do not employ a comprehensive approach; and third, they do not show a deep intention. Bluntly, most faculty development programs are superficially conceptualized, parochial in strategies and tactics, and capable of only trivial outcomes.

An adequate theory of faculty development will have several components. Involved will be a sophisticated understanding of the process of professionalization, understood historically, socially, institutionally. Also involved will be an integrating theory of human development. The structuralist approach to childhood and youth development, as shown in the work of Piaget, Erikson, and Kohlberg, must find its counterpart in a theory of adult development, with appropriate applications to faculty. At the Wright Institute, Berkeley, Nevitt Sanford and his colleagues are at work on theoretical and applied percepts of human development within educational institutions and for faculty. But the Wright Institute people are exceptions to the prevailing condition and they, as well as the rest of us, need alternative formulations from which to choose and on which to base actual programs.

While the conceptualization of a faculty development program should be rooted in a theory of human development, approaches to faculty

development, in terms of strategies and tactics, should be multiple. Only an omnibus approach is good enough. Faculty development can be seen, as illustrated by the assigned topic of this session, as an appropriate response to shifting student interests and needs. But that is only one approach. Faculty development programs must also be seen as a response to shifting faculty interests and needs, to faculty as individuals as well as to the faculty as a professional body. Still other levels or approaches to be taken into account, beyond faculty development in the context of the campus culture or an academic tradition, include faculty development as a response to the interests and needs of the general society or of particular elements within it.

All of this leads easily into a third point, having to do with the deeper and more substantial outcomes that ought to be the objectives of a carefully conceptualized, multi-dimensional faculty development program. The extent to which the accomplishments of a faculty development program can be quantified is the extent to which that program may be trivialized. Deep qualitative objectives defy quantification but remain unquestionably important.

Having stated briefly the three areas of inquiry for this session, I will now proceed to work in and through and around them in a more detailed way.

The case for faculty development usually includes the following points: faculty need to be prepared to work with new students in new places, that is, with heretofore underrepresented elements who can be reached in heretofore unused locations. Faculty should be made acquainted with alternative

modes of teaching and learning, that is, with computer-assisted instruction, with videotapes and other media, with contract learning and the various personalized systems of instruction. Faculty ought to be more sophisticated in their knowledge of the workings of the institution, that is, about policies, procedures and campus politics. Also, faculty can become much more conscious of the end of the learning experience for which teaching is a means, that is, of the competencies students should acquire as a result of the courses taken.

Behind this case of faculty development is the concern for institutional survival. Colleges and universities are alarmed by their attrition rates (usually only about 40 percent of a cohort group proceed from freshman through senior year) and that loss is attributed, in part, to inadequate advising and poor teaching. Schools are equally troubled about student apathy to the collegiate experience and the growing uncertainty among parents as well as the general public about the importance of college. The "alternatives to college" theme is being orchestrated these days but, of course, to educational traditionalists it sounds like a John Cage composition. Then, there is the competition for funding, pitting education against other agencies of society, particularly health services, and the probability that allocations to colleges and universities will not increase fast enough to cover inflation, let alone allow for the growth or strengthening of existing programs. No wonder that there is interest in faculty development programs calculated to increase productivity, achieve efficiencies and assure accountability.

One might understandably conclude that the institution's concern for survival coupled with the individual faculty member's concern for job security would assure support for faculty development programs. But such is not the case. Few colleges or universities have new money for such activities and interior reallocations call for sleight-of-hand tricks at which most educators are not very good. (It should be noted in passing that some places are designating for faculty improvement about one to three percent of the instructional budget.) Also, younger and older faculty are sensitive to an implied criticism which is carried by the notion of faculty development. Who's underdeveloped? To be tapped for a development program seems to some faculty like being a freshman invited into dumbbell English. Then there is a feeling among faculty that the true professional will tend to his own development. Do lawyers and doctors have development programs?

Yet, despite these hesitancies, faculty are coming forward to investigate possibilities. Many professional societies are promoting this movement through their committees on teaching. Workshops and conferences are being held to encourage faculty to talk about teaching. One rationale is that the most influential faculty not only do research but they also describe it. And those descriptions, written and verbal, are intended to inform others and elicit comment and criticism. Perhaps faculty should not only teach but also talk and write about it; presenting their purposes, themes and hypotheses, describing their methodologies, reporting processes and listing outcomes. As with research, the intention would be to inform as well as benefit from this exchange with others.

Yet the hesitation on the part of faculty makes sense, for reasons beyond those already stated. Most of the ideas being discussed in connection with faculty development programs are of greater importance to the institution than to the individual, to administration than to faculty. Also, they have more to do with procedures than with substance. They have less to do with learning and the learner than they do with quantifying and categorizing the relationship between teacher and student. There is an understandable hesitation on the part of faculty to collaborate in this kind of development. Remember, to equate faculty development with quantitative efficiency is to trivialize teaching and learning. That which can be quantified in the institution of education is the least important part of the educational experience. To devise a means for counting birds in the air is not to understand flying.

There are skills to be taught and learned, verbal skills, quantitative skills and conceptual skills. And these competencies can be related to vocations and other practicalities of life. There is subject matter to be transmitted and information to be learned. And its significance for citizenship and the life of social responsibility can usually be demonstrated. But when the institution of higher education is properly defined and fully understood, we must conclude that these activities and accomplishments are not the heart of the enterprise. What the faculty should encourage in students is not only mastery of a body of knowledge but familiarity with various modes of knowing; not only acquaintance with the ways people learn but acceptance of the spirit of inquiry. To provoke curiosity and inquisitiveness so that a person's questions are lifted to a new level of

complexity is an accomplishment of the most basic order. To develop faculty skills in pursuit of that achievement is a truly important objective. And it is one that should enlist faculty cooperation for it is a goal that is true to the best tradition of their profession as well as to the best objective of the institution of higher education.

Of course it is hard to measure changes of that sort, but it is not impossible. Surely a faculty member can devise questions to be asked of students, at the beginning of a course of study, the answers to which would show not only the level of the student's familiarity with the raw datum of the subject matter but also the student's capacity for theory, for criticism, for relational thinking. These same questions could then be asked at the end of the course, with comparisons made to determine the extent to which the student has moved ahead not only in terms of answers given but questions asked.

The deeper aims, then, are to encourage in the student a capacity for good judgment, an ability to untangle scrambled thoughts, skill in sorting out options, weighing them against each other in order to finally choose and act. All of the institutions of society are educational institutions in the sense that they all contribute to the realization of these goals in the person, but the college or university is the institution in society which is consciously committed, as its first purpose, to advancing these outcomes.

Faculty development programs, then, must help professors at this deep level of professional accomplishment. This is what it means to really get back to basics.

There is work to be done at other levels, of course, and my emphasis on faculty development that is aimed at something more than efficiency or "proof" of effectiveness is not intended to undermine the importance of what can be done regarding techniques and procedures. There should be workshops for entering teachers on procedures such as preparing lectures and other presentations, on evaluation of student achievement, on academic advising, on student characteristics and the variations in student-faculty interaction. Faculty should be encouraged to have their lectures, seminars, and discussions videotaped for their own study. It is also important to familiarize faculty with alternative modes of teaching and learning, with self-paced instruction, field experience, the use of media, and credit for prior learning.

Faculty need to know more than they do about the problems that legislators and trustees face when money must be allocated. How unfair it is to give sponsors and monitors no stated purposes for programs and courses, no criteria for measuring accomplishments, no basis for comparative judgments when, by the nature of their responsibility, legislators and boards must make comparative judgments. Faculty will be evaluated by their peers, by students, by external agencies, by the constituency of an educational institution. Faculty will either participate in determining procedures for assessment or the necessary norms and means will be determined elsewhere.

Nor will these matters go away simply because a legislator leaves office or when there is a change in campus administration. Faculty who think so are engaging in comforting but damaging self-deception. And it won't do to

insist that faculty be held accountable only to the judgments of their professional peers. Clients and patients participate in the judgment of lawyers and doctors. Indeed, these professionals are more and more accountable to public policy. And this is as it should be since most of the important issues in their work, as with those of academic professionals, have more to do with ethics and morality, with philosophy and theology, with sociology, psychology and politics than with technical or scientific judgments.

More attention needs to be given to the deeper levels of faculty development precisely because so many of the issues are not procedural but substantive. Consider, for example, how important it is for faculty to be exemplars of the best values of the educated person. Faculty probably teach most through what they do and are, certainly more than by what they say. Telling a student to read is not nearly as persuasive as showing the student, in terms of one's own attitudes and actions, the power, beauty and usefulness of a life informed by books and reading.

It was popular not long ago to argue that a professional's service is distinct and separate from his or her personal characteristics. To be sure, we care more about what the surgeon does in the operating room than what he did the night before. But to stop with that distinction is simplistic. What the doctor is personally will affect his professional skills. What the psychotherapist experiences in his own life will influence his advice. Likewise, the teacher's life affects his teaching--and his students. For students are watching, listening; not only to the subject matter of the course but to the example of the professor--the one who professes.

Interest has revived these days in the education of the whole person. We are being reminded that body, mind and emotions all figure in the learning experience. Hence the return of attention to the role of imagination and to mind-body integration. Interest in the student as a person ought to be balanced by interest in the professor as a person. The awareness that students learn in many ways and places, in clubs, games, and coffee houses, as well as in classrooms, must be balanced by the realization that students learn from faculty in various ways--from the mentor who is a teacher and a person, from the one whose personal life affects his professional life.

It is a worthy goal, then, to encourage faculty to embody the values of education, to be role models of the educated person. If faculty sense, as they should, that the institution of higher education has always sought to stand slightly apart from society, to be in some special measure a center of independent thinking, a place characterized by creativity and criticism, let them also know or be reminded in a time when the pressures to become mere functionaries and time-servers are great that they are professionals who as individuals should embody that which they espouse for the institution and that which they would encourage in students, that is, the attitude of curiosity and inquisitiveness, the capacity for perspective and compassion, the ability to think relationally and contextually.

Faculty are not hacks, but professionals. In the art and craft of teaching and learning, they are authorities. And the dignity and significance of this profession should mean enough to them that they strive to

embody its best qualities in their own lives. This is a goal of faculty development.

The Lilly Endowment is expressing interest in qualitative faculty development by supporting efforts to update faculty skills in subject-matter specializations and by educating faculty in ways to increase teaching effectiveness. Faculty from liberal arts colleges are going to major universities to learn about the latest developments in their disciplines and they are getting together with other faculty to discuss how best to teach what they have learned. The Danforth Foundation is cooperating with various colleges and universities in establishing centers for teaching and learning. Some of these programs will be "centering" on the improvement of the graduate experience for persons who are preparing for teaching, with special emphasis on the Teaching Assistant's situation. Others will concentrate on the needs of certain learners, such as the so-called nontraditional student, and will work with faculty to increase their effectiveness with these learners. Another program will examine the significance for faculty of the current interest shown by many students in professional training, vocationalism or career education. Can the traditions of liberal learning be reconciled with the preprofessionalism of students in liberal arts colleges? Other centers will concentrate on the mid-career problems and interests of faculty, noting especially the shifts in orientation and prospects for career alternatives. Underlying all of these activities will be a concern for assumptions, attitudes, purposes, values. The movement in the centers will be from the "how to" questions and answers

to those dealing with "why" and "so what?" These are efforts to help faculty exemplify liberal, humane learning.

Here is another area of concentration for faculty development, again at that deeper level of importance. Faculty ought to assume leadership in helping to achieve a unifying social philosophy for this nation. More accurately, the challenge now is to establish an educational rationale, plus curriculum and governance, that will be appropriate for the situation into which we seem to be moving in this country and throughout the world.

Analysts of conditions (Toynbee, Heilbroner) predict that within the next 20 years America will experience authoritarian government, a reduced standard of living and the containment of personal freedom. Also, the need to conserve natural resources and cope with the world's population growth will necessitate a reduction of at least 10 percent in our standard of living. America is now consuming 30 to 40 percent of the world's natural resources. We eat five times as much beef as the body can assimilate. The requirements of human survival on this globe will not only mandate limitations and controls but, additionally, will necessitate a reorientation of this nation's assumptions and values.

The home and church, media and education plus other institutions and agencies will be enlisted to educate our citizenry for this radically different future. But in our colleges and universities there are 600,000 faculty who constitute a special resource. Without claiming that they are the most creative persons (they are not), it is fair to assert that they are the best-educated cadre of leaders in the nation and that they could

be crucial in bringing people to understand the changes, perils and prospects of the next few decades.

It seems evident that rampant individualism so cherished in America is one emphasis that will have to be altered. Also the limits of pluralism and diversity will have to be set. There will be reasons to reexamine notions of community and explore the satisfactions of shared experience. Faculty should be encouraged to bring their competencies to bear on these prospects, with special attention to the significance of such changes for the curriculum. For example, individually-patterned courses of study are now popular. Individual learning contracts are often a tacit acknowledgment that the general education program has lost whatever coherence it ever had and is nothing more than course and FTE trade-offs between faculty interest groups. There hasn't been a definitive and widely influential movement in general education since Columbia's program in 1919. The Harvard "Redbook" (1945) was the last major attempt to explain and persuade, albeit a failure at that university. If in fact the United States is approaching a time when our people will of necessity live closer together, with greater interdependency, when the measured or controlled response will be required, it is time for faculty to evaluate present curriculum offerings to determine whether they are still appropriate or whether they have become essentially dysfunctional in terms of preparing people for that future. Many aspects of the curriculum, obviously, are out of phase not only with future prospects but current realities.

It must be granted that most faculty are ill-organized and poorly disposed for this endeavor. They were trained and socialized in the '50's and '60's when emphasis was on individual growth and institutional expansion. The profession's values as well as those of the sponsors featured expanded budgets, more land and buildings, higher enrollments, satellite campuses--all the values and features that we have come to identify with the complex university. Faculty sought degrees, awards, research and publication, plus special assignments likely to set each person apart. Can such people be changed? Rather than conclude that nothing can be done, it is better to see ideational reorientation as a challenge to faculty development.

Again, can it happen? Is it realistic to try? Yes, both of the objectives stated earlier--faculty as exemplars of the educational ideal and faculty as leaders in defining the social philosophy--are deep in the academic tradition. The profession at its best, as stated earlier, has always insisted that an educational institution serves society best when it is a center of critical and creative thinking. And faculty have repeatedly accepted the challenges of society regarding new tasks. The Land Grant colleges and their faculties have historically worked with students, most from rural areas, who often lacked requisite skills. Urban universities and their faculties (such as CCNY) have for decades grappled with the challenge of ethnic diversity.

In one sense, then, the task is less faculty development and more nearly faculty renewal. Faculty should be asked to take up again those

tasks and responsibilities to which they have traditionally laid claim. Faculty can be developed by being renewed.

The administrative or institutional perspective on development programs, I have argued, defines success as the achievement of greater faculty productivity, as the ability of faculty to teach students so that their learning can be evaluated by competency measures, as skill in holding students in the institution so as to reduce attrition rates, as improved faculty use of facilities by night or in off-seasons, and so on.

Yet the best administrators recognize that individual development may be primary to or be of equal importance with those institutional goals. That is, unless faculty get in touch with themselves, they will not relate effectively to students. Until faculty have a sense of personal well-being, seeing themselves as valued and important, they cannot contribute much to the achievement of institutional well-being.

It is this latter thrust that is the present contribution of structuralist-developmental theory, i.e., that the educational community we seek, which can only properly be a community of individuals, will not be realized until strength in individuality is achieved. But with that emphasis comes a problem. Because of humankind's endless fascination with the self, we may never get beyond self-exploration and into a serious investigation of the contributions and requirements of true community. Typically, community is understood from the point of view of the inclinations and conveniences of the self. Community exists for self-fulfillment. Self-fulfillment is not conceived as fidelity to the claims of community.

Clearly we need more than the psychological-developmental approach which deals mainly with the strengthening of the individual, even as we need more than the administrative-bureaucratic approach which measures development by institutional criteria.

Perhaps there are administrators or faculty here who can help us move beyond our substantial complaints and our spirit of complaining about existing faculty development programs and toward the achievement of adequate theory, comprehensive approaches, and motivating purposes. That would really be an interesting development!